

Unambiguous discrimination of mixed quantum states

Chi Zhang,^{1,*} Yuan Feng,^{1,†} and Mingsheng Ying^{1,‡}

¹*State Key Laboratory of Intelligent Technology and Systems,
Department of Computer Science and Technology Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, 100084*
(Dated: February 1, 2008)

The problem of unambiguous discrimination between mixed quantum states is addressed by isolating the part of each mixed state which has no contribution to discrimination and by employing the strategy of set discrimination of pure states. A necessary and sufficient condition of unambiguous mixed state discrimination is presented. An upper bound of the efficiency is also derived.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum state discrimination is an essential problem in quantum information theory. It was first considered for pure states in the literature. One strategy of quantum state discrimination is that one is asked to distinguish the given states without error, but a non-zero probability of inconclusive answer is allowed. Such a strategy is called unambiguous discrimination. Unambiguous discrimination for pure states was originally addressed by Ivanovic [1], and then Dieks [2] and Peres [3], all of whom focused on the case in which the two states have equal prior probabilities. Their results have been extended to the case of two pure states with unequal prior probability by Jaeger and Shimony [4]. Furthermore, Chefles [5] considered the general case of n quantum pure states and pointed out that they can be unambiguously discriminated if and only if they are linearly independent. It was observed by Sun *et al* [6] that finding the optimal unambiguous discrimination, which has the maximal success probability, can be reduced to a semi-definite programming (SDP) problem. In Ref.[7], Eldar developed a set of necessary and sufficient conditions for optimal unambiguous discrimination. Zhang *et al* [8] and Feng *et al* [9] derived two lower bounds on the inconclusive probability of unambiguous discrimination among n pure states.

Recently, the unambiguous discrimination among mixed states attracted a lot of attention in the quantum information community. Rudolph *et al* [10] derived a lower and upper bound on the maximal success probability of unambiguous discrimination of two mixed states. Raynal *et al* [11] developed a method which eliminate unwanted subspaces of states to reduce the discrimination of mixed states to that of some simpler states which have the same rank. Fiurasek and Jezek [12] introduced some necessary and sufficient conditions on the optimal unambiguous discrimination and presented a numerical method. Eldar [13] also obtained some necessary and sufficient conditions for optimal unambiguous discrimination. Feng *et al* [15] gave a necessary and sufficient

condition for unambiguous discrimination, and derived a series of lower bounds on the inconclusive probability for unambiguous discrimination. Another necessary and sufficient condition is mentioned in Ref.[17] by Chefles.

The problem of unambiguously discriminating mixed quantum states can be formally stated as follows. A quantum system is secretly prepared in one of m mixed states $\{\rho_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Each ρ_i is in the n -dimensional Hilbert space and $n \geq m$. The strategy to discriminate the states is to design a general measurement which consists of linear operators Π_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$, satisfying $\sum_{i=0}^m \Pi_i = I$. If for any $i \neq j$, $i \neq 0$, $\text{Tr}(\Pi_i \rho_j) = 0$, then when outcome i ($i \neq 0$) is observed, one may claim with certainty that the system is originally in the state ρ_i , and occurrence of outcome 0 means that the identification fails to give a report.

As a natural generalization of discrimination of pure states, Zhang *et al* [14] considered the problem of set discrimination. Suppose that a quantum system is secretly prepared in one of some pure states which have been partitioned into a family of disjoint sets. The aim of set discrimination is to tell which set the state of the system is in.

It is well-known that mixed states can be regarded as ensembles of pure states. So a natural question is whether we can perform mixed state discrimination by using set discrimination of pure states. The main purpose of the current paper is to give a positive answer to this question. First, we give a method to divide each ρ_i into two parts. The first parts are intrinsically undifferentiated, in the sense that they cannot unambiguously discriminated, while the second parts of these states can be further separated into linearly independent pure states. This allows us to reduce a problem of discriminating mixed states into a corresponding problem of set discrimination for pure states. Then we are able to give a necessary and sufficient condition on unambiguous discrimination of mixed states by using some related results in Ref.[14]. Furthermore, the efficiency of mixed state discrimination is carefully examined, and we present an upper bound on it. Finally, the concept of set discrimination is generalized to the case of mixed states. It is concluded that for mixed states, the problem of unambiguous set discrimination is just equivalent to that of state discrimination. This is quite different from the case of pure states.

*Electronic address: zangcy00@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

†Electronic address: fengy99g@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

‡Electronic address: yingmsh@tsinghua.edu.cn

II. DIVISION OF MIXED STATES

As we know, a mixed state can be given rise from some ensembles of pure states. If a measurement can unambiguously discriminate the ensembles for the mixed states we consider, it can also discriminate the corresponding mixed states. As a result, at the first glance, it seems that the technique of set discrimination of pure states can be directly used to deal with discrimination of mixed states. Unfortunately, it is not the case. Indeed, the condition for a family of pure state sets to be unambiguously discriminated, is that the span space of each set is linearly independent to that of the others [14]. This condition is very strict and cannot be satisfied when two mixed states is considered to have joint support space. But lots of such states can be unambiguously discriminated virtually.

However, things are not so dismaying. In this section, we first divide each mixed state into two parts, such that the the first part of each state has the support space contained in the sum of the other states' support spaces, while the second part of each state has the support space which intersects the sum of all other states' support spaces only at the zero space. Then we can concentrate our attention to the second parts of these mixed states and the technique of set discrimination can be applied.

To prove the possibility of the division, we start with the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *Let ρ be a density matrix with support space S . For any subspace $M \subseteq S$, there exists a unique pair of positive matrices, ρ_1 and ρ_2 , such that*

- (1) $\rho_1 + \rho_2 = \rho$;
- (2) $\text{supp}(\rho_1) = M$;
- (3) $\text{supp}(\rho_1) \cap \text{supp}(\rho_2) = \{0\}$.

Proof. Suppose $\{|\psi_i\rangle, i = 1, \dots, m\}$ are linearly independent unnormalized vectors and $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^m |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$, which implies that the dimension of space S is m . Define matrix $\Psi = (|\psi_1\rangle \dots |\psi_m\rangle)$.

First we claim that there exists unitary matrix $U = (U_1 \ U_2)$ such that $\text{span}(\Psi U_1) = M$.

Note that $M \subseteq S = \text{span}(|\psi_i\rangle)$. Let n be the dimension of subspace M . There exist linearly independent vectors $\{|\varphi_1\rangle, \dots, |\varphi_n\rangle\}$ in C^m satisfying

$$\text{span}(\Psi|\varphi_i\rangle : i = 1, \dots, n) = M. \quad (1)$$

From the vectors $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}$, we can produce by Cram-Schmidt procedure a set $\{|u_i\rangle : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ of normalized vectors whose span space is just the span space of $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}$. It is then easy to see that $\text{span}(\Psi|u_i\rangle : i = 1, \dots, n)$ is the span space of $\{\Psi|\varphi_i\rangle : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, i.e.

$$\text{span}(\Psi|u_i\rangle : i = 1, \dots, n) = M. \quad (2)$$

For the normalized vectors $\{|u_i\rangle : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, there exist normalized vectors $\{|u_j\rangle : j = n+1, \dots, m\}$ whose

span space is orthogonal to $\text{span}(|u_i\rangle : i = 1, \dots, n)$. So the matrix $U = (|u_1\rangle \dots |u_m\rangle)$ is a unitary matrix. Let $U_1 = (|u_1\rangle \dots |u_n\rangle)$, and $U_2 = (|u_{n+1}\rangle \dots |u_m\rangle)$. Then we obtain that $\text{span}(\Psi U_1) = M$.

Next, we consider $\text{span}(\Psi U_1)$ and $\text{span}(\Psi U_2)$. Because the columns of Ψ , $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$, are linearly independent, we have

$$\text{span}(\Psi U_1) \cap \text{span}(\Psi U_2) = \{0\} \quad (3)$$

from the fact that $\text{span}(U_1) \cap \text{span}(U_2) = \{0\}$. Let $\rho_1 = \Psi U_1 U_1^\dagger \Psi^\dagger$, and $\rho_2 = \Psi U_2 U_2^\dagger \Psi^\dagger$. It can be easily observed that $\text{supp}(\rho_1) = \text{span}(\Psi U_1)$ and $\text{supp}(\rho_2) = \text{span}(\Psi U_2)$. From Eqs.(2) and (3), we know that ρ_1, ρ_2 are the matrices we want.

Now, we will show that the matrices ρ_1 and ρ_2 are unique. Assume that there are two different pairs $\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}, \{\rho'_1, \rho'_2\}$ satisfying the conditions (1), (2), (3) in this lemma, and

$$\rho_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|, \quad \rho_2 = \sum_{i=n+1}^m |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|; \quad (4)$$

$$\rho'_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |\psi'_i\rangle\langle\psi'_i|, \quad \rho'_2 = \sum_{i=n+1}^m |\psi'_i\rangle\langle\psi'_i|. \quad (5)$$

Because of the unitary freedom in the ensembles for density matrices, there must exist a unitary matrix V satisfying

$$|\psi'_i\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^m v_{ij} |\psi_j\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n v_{ij} |\psi_j\rangle + \sum_{j=n+1}^m v_{ij} |\psi_j\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where v_{ij} is the (i, j) element of V . Since $\text{span}(|\psi'_i\rangle : i = 1, \dots, n) = M$ and $\text{span}(|\psi_i\rangle : i = n+1, \dots, m) \cap M = \{0\}$, we know that $v_{ij} = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n, n+1 \leq j \leq m$ or $1 \leq j \leq n, n+1 \leq i \leq m$, i.e.,

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & V_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

for some unitary matrices V_1 and V_2 . Now, from the fact:

$$(|\psi_1\rangle \dots |\psi_n\rangle) = (|\psi'_1\rangle \dots |\psi'_n\rangle) V_1 \quad (8)$$

and

$$(|\psi_{n+1}\rangle \dots |\psi_m\rangle) = (|\psi'_{n+1}\rangle \dots |\psi'_m\rangle) V_2, \quad (9)$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^n |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \\ &= (|\psi_1\rangle \dots |\psi_n\rangle) \begin{pmatrix} \langle\psi_1| \\ \vdots \\ \langle\psi_n| \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (|\psi'_1\rangle \dots |\psi'_n\rangle) V_1 V_1^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \langle\psi'_1| \\ \vdots \\ \langle\psi'_n| \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \rho'_1. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

And $\rho_2 = \rho - \rho_1 = \rho - \rho'_1 = \rho'_2$. This completes the proof. $\square$

We now need to introduce several notations which allow us to use Lemma 1 properly in the remainder of this paper.

Since the intersection of the kernels of all ρ_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, is not useful for the purpose of unambiguous discrimination [15], we can assume without loss of generality that each measurement operator Π_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, is in the sum of support spaces of all ρ_i [18].

Define the space $\text{Mix}(\rho_i)$ for each state ρ_i as follows:

$$\text{Mix}(\rho_i) = \text{supp}(\rho_i) \cap \bigcap_{j=1, j \neq i}^m \text{supp}(\rho_j). \quad (11)$$

It is obvious that for any ρ_i , $\text{Mix}(\rho_i) \subseteq \text{supp}(\rho_i)$. From Lemma 1, each ρ_i can be divided into two parts, $\tilde{\rho}_i$ and $\hat{\rho}_i$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_i + \tilde{\rho}_i &= \rho_i; \\ \text{supp}(\hat{\rho}_i) &= \text{Mix}(\rho_i); \\ \text{supp}(\tilde{\rho}_i) \cap \text{Mix}(\rho_i) &= \{0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, we define

$$\tilde{\rho}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\rho}_i. \quad (13)$$

Then $\tilde{\rho}_i$ is called the core of mixed state ρ_i , for each $i = 1, \dots, m$.

From these definitions, it is easy to see

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \text{supp}(\rho_i) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^m \text{supp}(\tilde{\rho}_i). \quad (14)$$

Moreover, we have the following lemma which establishes a close link from discrimination measurement of $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$ to $\{\tilde{\rho}_0, \dots, \tilde{\rho}_m\}$.

Lemma 2 *A measurement which consists of operators $\{\Pi_0, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ can unambiguously discriminate $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$ if and only if for any $i \neq j$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 0, \dots, m$,*

$$\Pi_i \tilde{\rho}_j = 0, \quad \tilde{\rho}_j \Pi_i = 0. \quad (15)$$

Proof. From Ref.[15], we know that any measurement $\{\Pi_0, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ can unambiguously discriminate mixed states $\{\rho_i : i = 1, \dots, m\}$ if and only if for any $i \neq j$, it holds that $\Pi_i \rho_j = 0$ and $\rho_j \Pi_i = 0$.

And from the definitions given above, for any $j = 1, \dots, m$, we have $\rho_j = \tilde{\rho}_j + \hat{\rho}_j$. Because of the positivity of $\tilde{\rho}_j$ and $\hat{\rho}_j$, the statement that operators $\{\Pi_i\}$ can unambiguously discriminate states $\{\rho_j\}$ is equivalent to that for any $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \dots, m$,

$$\Pi_i \tilde{\rho}_j = 0, \quad \tilde{\rho}_j \Pi_i = 0, \quad (16)$$

and

$$\Pi_i \hat{\rho}_j = 0, \quad \hat{\rho}_j \Pi_i = 0. \quad (17)$$

Because of Eq.(11) and Eq.(12), for any $i = 1, \dots, m$, it holds that

$$\text{supp}(\hat{\rho}_i) \subseteq \sum_{j \neq i} \text{supp}(\rho_j). \quad (18)$$

As a result, when $i = j$, Eq.(17) is also satisfied. Furthermore, by the definition of $\tilde{\rho}_0$, Eq.(17) is equivalent to that $\Pi_i \tilde{\rho}_0 = 0$ and $\tilde{\rho}_0 \Pi_i = 0$, for any i . This completes the proof. $\square$

With the help of above lemmas, now we are able to transform the problem of unambiguously discriminating mixed states into that of unambiguously discriminating sets of pure states. Such a transformation is explicitly presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Let $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$ be a set of mixed states, and let $\{\tilde{\rho}_0, \tilde{\rho}_1, \dots, \tilde{\rho}_m\}$ be their "core"s, which has been defined by Eqs.(12) and (13). Furthermore, suppose that for each $0 \leq i \leq n$, S_i is a set of pure states, such that*

$$\tilde{\rho}_i = \sum_{|\psi\rangle \in S_i} p_{|\psi\rangle} |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|, \quad (19)$$

and $p_{|\psi\rangle} > 0$ for each $|\psi\rangle \in S_i$. Then the measurement $\{\Pi_, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ unambiguously discriminate $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$ if and only if for some operator Π_0 , the measurement $\{\Pi_* - \Pi_0, \Pi_0, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ unambiguously discriminate sets $\{S_0, S_1, \dots, S_m\}$, where both Π_* and $\Pi_* - \Pi_0$ are introduced for the inconclusive reports.*

Proof. " $\implies$ ". From the conditions, for any $i = 0, \dots, m$, $S_i = \{|\psi_{ik}\rangle\}$ gives rise to the density matrix $\tilde{\rho}_i$ with probabilities $\{q_{ik}\}$, which means

$$\tilde{\rho}_i = \sum_k q_{ik} |\psi_{ik}\rangle \langle \psi_{ik}|, \quad (20)$$

where $\sum_k q_{ik}$ is not necessarily 1.

Let $\{\Pi_*, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ be any measurement which can unambiguously discriminate the mixed states, i.e., $\text{Tr}(\Pi_j \rho_i) = 0$, for any $i \neq j$.

From Eq.(17), we have, for any $i, j = 1, \dots, m$,

$$\text{Tr}(\Pi_j \hat{\rho}_i) = 0. \quad (21)$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\Pi_j \rho_i) &= \text{Tr}(\Pi_j \tilde{\rho}_i) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} q_{ik} \langle \psi_{ik} | \Pi_j | \psi_{ik} \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Because every element in Eq.(22) is nonnegative, when $i \neq j$, $\text{Tr}(\Pi_j \rho_i) = 0$, it holds that $\langle \psi_{ik} | \Pi_j | \psi_{ik} \rangle = 0$, for any k .

Furthermore, since $\Pi_j \tilde{\rho}_0 = 0$ and $\tilde{\rho}_0 \Pi_j = 0$, $\langle \psi_{0k} | \Pi_j | \psi_{0k} \rangle = 0$, for any k, j . It is easy to see that the measurement $\{\Pi_*, 0, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ can unambiguously discriminate the sets, leaving the efficiency of identifying set S_0 zero.

“ $\Leftarrow$ ”. Let $\{\Pi_{\dagger}, \Pi_0, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ be any measurement operators which can unambiguously discriminate the sets. Because $\text{supp}(\hat{\rho}_i) \subseteq \text{supp}(\hat{\rho}_0) = \text{span}(S_0)$, we have

$$\text{Tr}(\Pi_j \hat{\rho}_i) = 0, \quad (23)$$

for any $i, j = 1, \dots, m$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\Pi_j \rho_i) &= \text{Tr}(\Pi_j \tilde{\rho}_i) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} q_{ik} \langle \psi_{ik} | \Pi_j | \psi_{ik} \rangle \\ &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} q_{ik} \gamma_{ik} \right) \delta_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where γ_{ik} is the efficiency of identifying $|\psi_{ik}\rangle$ in the set unambiguous discrimination. In this way, the measurement $\{\Pi_* = \Pi_{\dagger} + \Pi_0, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ can unambiguously discriminate the mixed states $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$. $\square$

Then a corollary, which presents a necessary and sufficient condition of unambiguous discrimination between mixed states, can be derived.

Corollary 1 *The states $\{\rho_i : i = 1, \dots, m\}$ can be unambiguously discriminated if and only if for any $i = 1, \dots, m$, the core of ρ_i , $\tilde{\rho}_i$, is not zero.*

Proof. “ $\Rightarrow$ ”. Suppose that $\tilde{\rho}_i = 0$, for some $1 \leq i \leq m$. From Eq.(17), we know that for any unambiguous discrimination operators $\{\Pi_i\}$

$$\text{Tr}(\Pi_i \rho_i) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_i \tilde{\rho}_i) = 0, \quad (25)$$

which contradicts the definition of unambiguous discrimination.

“ $\Leftarrow$ ”. Let $\{S_i : i = 0, \dots, m\}$ be any state sets satisfying that S_i can give rise to state $\tilde{\rho}_i$, $i = 0, \dots, m$. From Eq.(14), $\{S_i\}$ are linearly independent. By using the results presented in Ref.[14], we can design a measurement $\{\Pi_{\dagger}, \Pi_0, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ to unambiguously discriminate them. From Theorem 1, the measurement operators $\{\Pi_* = \Pi_{\dagger} + \Pi_0, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ can discriminate the mixed states $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$ unambiguously. $\square$

To conclude this section, we compare the results obtained in this section with some related works. It is easy to see that when the states are all pure, the condition given in the above corollary degenerates to the known necessary and sufficient condition for pure state discrimination presented in Ref.[5]. In Ref.[15], Feng *et al* pointed out that mixed states $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$ can be unambiguously discriminated if and only if for any $i \neq j$, $\text{span}(S) \neq \text{span}(S_i)$, where $S = \{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$ and $S_i = S \setminus \{\rho_i\}$. From Eq.(14), it is easy to see $\text{span}(S_i) \oplus \text{supp}(\tilde{\rho}_i) = \text{span}(S)$. So, the condition in Corollary 1 and that presented in Ref.[15] are equivalent. In Ref.[17], Chefles also gave a necessary and sufficient condition for mixed state discrimination which requires that the orthogonal complements of $\sum_{j \neq i} \text{supp}(\rho_j)$ is not a subspace of the orthogonal complement of $\text{supp}(\rho_i)$, for any i . The condition is the same as that $\text{supp}(\rho_i) \not\subseteq$

$\sum_{j \neq i} \text{supp}(\rho_j)$ and can be easily reduced to the condition given in Ref.[15], which have been proved equivalent to the condition in Corollary 1.

III. EFFICIENCY OF UNAMBIGUOUS DISCRIMINATION

In the last section, we have established a close link between mixed state discrimination and set discrimination of pure states. In this section, we are going to evaluate efficiency of unambiguous discrimination of mixed states by using this link.

In Ref. [14], Zhang *et al* showed that the sets $\{S_0, \dots, S_1\}$ can be unambiguously discriminated with efficiency $\{\gamma_{ik} : i = 0, \dots, m; k = 1, \dots, n_i\}$ if and only if there are matrices $\{\Gamma_0, \dots, \Gamma_m\}$ such that Γ_i is a $n_i \times n_i$ positive matrix with the k th diagonal entry being γ_{ik} , and the matrix

$$X - \Gamma \geq 0, \quad (26)$$

where $X = (\langle \psi_{ik} | \psi_{jl} \rangle)$, and $\Gamma = \text{diag}(\Gamma_0, \dots, \Gamma_m)$. Thus, the problem of evaluating the optimal efficiency of set discrimination of pure states is connected to a problem of semi-positive programming.

On the other hand, it is shown in Theorem 1 that the measurement operators $\{\Pi_*, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ can unambiguously discriminate states $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$, if and only if there exists Π_0 to make measurement operators $\{\Pi_* - \Pi_0, \Pi_0, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ unambiguously discriminate sets $\{S_0, \dots, S_m\}$ which give rise to the density operators $\{\tilde{\rho}_0, \dots, \tilde{\rho}_m\}$ defined by Eqs. (11) and (13). Combining these results enables us to derive an estimation of the efficiency of unambiguous discrimination of mixed states

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_i &= \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} q_{ik} |\psi_{ik}\rangle \langle \psi_{ik}| \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} |\tilde{\psi}_{ik}\rangle \langle \tilde{\psi}_{ik}|, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $i = 0, \dots, m$, $\{|\psi_{ik}\rangle\}$ are pure states in set S_i , and $|\tilde{\psi}_{ik}\rangle = \sqrt{q_{ik}} |\psi_{ik}\rangle$. Let γ_i is the the success probability of identifying ρ_i in the mixed state discrimination. From Eq.(24), we have

$$\gamma_i = \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \gamma_{ik} q_{ik} \right), \quad (28)$$

where $\{q_{ik}\}$ are defined in Eq.(27), and γ_{ik} is the efficiency of discriminating $|\psi_{ik}\rangle$ in set S_i , which can be determined by Eq.(26). So, we have

$$\gamma_i = \text{Tr}(Q_i \Gamma_i Q_i), \quad (29)$$

where $Q_i = \text{diag}(\sqrt{q_{ik}})$, $k = 1, \dots, n_i$, and Γ_i is a $n_i \times n_i$ positive matrix with the k th diagonal entry being γ_{ik} .

Let $Q = \text{diag}(Q_0, \dots, Q_m)$, $\tilde{X} = QXQ$, $\tilde{\Gamma} = Q\Gamma Q$. Since Q is a positive diagonal matrix, from Eq.(26), we obtain

$$\tilde{X} - \tilde{\Gamma} \geq 0. \quad (30)$$

It is easy to see that $\tilde{X} = \left(\langle \tilde{\psi}_{ik} | \tilde{\psi}_{jl} \rangle \right)$, $\tilde{\Gamma} = \text{diag}(\tilde{\Gamma}_0, \dots, \tilde{\Gamma}_m)$, and $\tilde{\Gamma}_i$ is a $n_i \times n_i$ positive matrix with its trace, $\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Gamma}_i)$, as the efficiency of discriminating ρ_i . Moreover, if measurement operators $\{\Pi_* - \Pi_0, \Pi_0, \dots, \Pi_m\}$ can unambiguously discriminate $\{S_0, \dots, S_m\}$, so do $\{\Pi_*, 0, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_m\}$, leaving the success probability of S_0 zero. Thus, let $\tilde{\Gamma}_0 = 0$, the Eq.(30) is also satisfied.

From the above argument, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2 *The mixed states $\{\rho_i : i = 1, \dots, m\}$, whose core, $\{\tilde{\rho}_i : i = 0, \dots, m\}$, can be expressed as Eq.(27), would be unambiguously discriminated with efficiency $\{\gamma_i : i = 1, \dots, m\}$ if and only if*

$$\tilde{X} - \tilde{\Gamma} \geq 0, \quad (31)$$

and

$$\tilde{\Gamma} \geq 0, \quad (32)$$

where $\tilde{X} = \left(\langle \tilde{\psi}_{ik} | \tilde{\psi}_{jl} \rangle \right)$, $\tilde{\Gamma} = \text{diag}(0, \tilde{\Gamma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\Gamma}_m)$, and $\gamma_i = \text{Tr}(\tilde{\Gamma}_i)$.

Notice that there are many different ensembles which can give rise to $\tilde{\rho}_i$. This implies that the matrix $\tilde{X}$ in the above theorem is not unique. We can prove that, however, the discrimination efficiency derived from different $\tilde{X}$ are the same.

For different ensembles $\{|\tilde{\psi}_{ik}\rangle\}$ and $\{|\tilde{\varphi}_{il}\rangle\}$ which give rise to the same density operator $\tilde{\rho}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_i &= \sum_k |\tilde{\psi}_{ik}\rangle \langle \tilde{\psi}_{ik}| \\ &= \sum_l |\tilde{\varphi}_{il}\rangle \langle \tilde{\varphi}_{il}| \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Because of the unitary freedom for ensembles, we have

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{ik}\rangle = \sum_l u_{kl} |\tilde{\varphi}_{il}\rangle, \quad (34)$$

where u_{kl} is the (k, l) entry of a unitary matrix U_i . Let $\tilde{X} = \left(\langle \tilde{\psi}_{ik_1} | \tilde{\psi}_{jk_2} \rangle \right)$, and $\tilde{Y} = \left(\langle \tilde{\varphi}_{il_1} | \tilde{\varphi}_{jl_2} \rangle \right)$, we have

$$\tilde{X} = U^\dagger \tilde{Y} U, \quad (35)$$

where $U = \text{diag}(I, U_1, \dots, U_m)$ which is also a unitary matrix.

For any $\tilde{\Gamma}$, let $\tilde{\Lambda} = U^\dagger \tilde{\Gamma} U$. Then $\tilde{\Gamma} \geq 0$ if and only if $\tilde{\Lambda} \geq 0$, and $\tilde{X} - \tilde{\Gamma} \geq 0$ if and only if $\tilde{Y} - \tilde{\Lambda} \geq 0$. The efficiency of discriminating state ρ_i in the second way is

$$\text{Tr}(\Lambda_i) = \text{Tr}(U_i^\dagger \Gamma_i U_i), \quad (36)$$

which is the same as that in the first way, $\text{Tr}(\Gamma_i)$. As a consequence, different ensembles for the same density operators do not introduce any difference in the efficiency of unambiguous discrimination.

It should be pointed out that, in Ref.[16], a result considering optimal efficiency of mixed state discrimination, has been derived by Eldar *et al.* However, the method she used is derived directly from the conditions of the measurement operators, which is quite different from ours. In this paper, we first combine the concept of set discrimination and the concept of mixed state discrimination.

IV. UPPER BOUND OF UNAMBIGUOUS DISCRIMINATION EFFICIENCY

For pure states, an upper bound for the maximal success probability of unambiguous discrimination was found in Refs. [8] and [9]. In this section, we derive an upper bound on the success probability of unambiguous discrimination among m mixed states $\{\rho_i\}$, with prior probability $\{\eta_i\}$.

First, we need to prove a lemma for positive matrix.

Lemma 3 *For any positive matrix $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B^\dagger & C \end{pmatrix}$, it holds that*

$$\text{Tr}(A)\text{Tr}(C) \geq \text{Tr}^2(\sqrt{B^\dagger B}). \quad (37)$$

Proof. Because $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B^\dagger & C \end{pmatrix}$ is positive, there must be matrices Q_1 and Q_2 satisfying that

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B^\dagger & C \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Q_1^\dagger \\ Q_2^\dagger \end{pmatrix} (Q_1 \ Q_2), \quad (38)$$

i.e. $A = Q_1^\dagger Q_1$, $B = Q_1^\dagger Q_2$, and $C = Q_2^\dagger Q_2$.

Furthermore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(A)\text{Tr}(C) &= \text{Tr}(Q_1^\dagger Q_1) \text{Tr}(Q_2^\dagger Q_2) \\ &= \text{Tr}(Q_1 Q_1^\dagger) \text{Tr}(Q_2 Q_2^\dagger) \\ &= \text{Tr}((Q_1 \ 0) U U^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} Q_1^\dagger \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) \text{Tr}(Q_2 Q_2^\dagger), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

for any unitary matrix U .

Using Cauchy inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(A)\text{Tr}(C) &\geq \left| \text{Tr}((Q_1 \ 0) U \begin{pmatrix} Q_2^\dagger \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) \right|^2 \\ &= \left| \text{Tr}((Q_1 \ 0) \begin{pmatrix} Q_2^\dagger \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} U) \right|^2 \\ &= \left| \text{Tr}(\begin{pmatrix} Q_2^\dagger Q_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U) \right|^2 \\ &= \left| \text{Tr}(\begin{pmatrix} B^\dagger & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U) \right|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Notice that for any operator M ,

$$\text{Tr} |M| = \max_V |\text{Tr}(MV)|, \quad (41)$$

where the maximum is taken over all unitary matrices V . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(A)\text{Tr}(C) &\geq \text{Tr}^2\left(\left|\begin{pmatrix} B^\dagger & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right|\right) \\ &= \text{Tr}^2\left(\sqrt{\begin{pmatrix} B^\dagger B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}}\right) \\ &= \text{Tr}^2(\sqrt{B^\dagger B}). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

So the proof is completed. $\square$

Using this lemma, we are able to give an upper bound for the efficiency of mixed state unambiguous discrimination.

Theorem 3 *For any unambiguous discrimination of mixed states $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m\}$ with prior probabilities $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m\}$, the efficiency P satisfies*

$$P \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_i) - \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1} \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_i \eta_j F^2(\tilde{\rho}_i, \tilde{\rho}_j)}, \quad (43)$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_i$ is the "core" of state ρ_i .

Proof. According to section III, we suppose that $q_{ik} = \langle \tilde{\psi}_{ik} | \tilde{\psi}_{ik} \rangle$, where $|\tilde{\psi}_{ik}\rangle$ is defined in Eq.(27). From the analysis in section III, we know that inconclusive probability satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i \text{Tr}(\Gamma_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i (1 - \text{Tr}(\Gamma_i)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} (q_{ik} - \gamma_{ik}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i (1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} q_{ik}), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where γ_{ik} is the k th diagonal entry of matrix Γ_i .

Let $\Psi_i = (|\tilde{\psi}_{i1}\rangle \dots |\tilde{\psi}_{in_i}\rangle)$. So the (i, j) block in matrix $\tilde{X}$ is $\Psi_i^\dagger \Psi_j$. Because $\tilde{X} - \tilde{\Gamma} \geq 0$, from Lemma 3, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} (q_{ik} - \gamma_{ik}) \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} (q_{jk} - \gamma_{jl}) \geq \text{Tr}^2(\sqrt{\Psi_j^\dagger \Psi_i \Psi_i^\dagger \Psi_j}). \quad (45)$$

Notice that $\tilde{\rho}_i = \Psi_i \Psi_i^\dagger$ and $\tilde{\rho}_j = \Psi_j \Psi_j^\dagger$. So, we have

$$\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_j} = (\Psi_j \ 0) U = U^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_j^\dagger \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

$$\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_j} \tilde{\rho}_i \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_j} = U^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_j^\dagger \tilde{\rho}_i \Psi_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U. \quad (47)$$

In this way, we know that the nonzero eigenvalues of $\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_j} \tilde{\rho}_i \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_j}$ are the same as the nonzero eigenvalues of $\Psi_j^\dagger \tilde{\rho}_i \Psi_j$. That means

$$\text{Tr}(\sqrt{\Psi_j^\dagger \tilde{\rho}_i \Psi_j}) = \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_j} \tilde{\rho}_i \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_j}) = F(\tilde{\rho}_i, \tilde{\rho}_j), \quad (48)$$

where F stands for fidelity. So it follows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} (q_{ik} - \gamma_{ik}) \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} (q_{jk} - \gamma_{jl}) \geq F^2(\tilde{\rho}_i, \tilde{\rho}_j). \quad (49)$$

Let $x_i = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} (q_{ik} - \gamma_{ik})$. For any $i \neq j$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} x_i x_j &= \eta_i \eta_j \sum_{k=1, l=1}^{n_i, n_j} (q_{ik} - \gamma_{ik})(q_{jl} - \gamma_{jl}) \\ &\geq \eta_i \eta_j F^2(\tilde{\rho}_i, \tilde{\rho}_j). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

By using Cauchy inequality

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i\right)^2 \geq \frac{m}{m-1} \sum_{i \neq j} x_i x_j, \quad (51)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i\right)^2} + \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i (1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} q_{ik}) \\ &\geq \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1} \sum_{i \neq j} x_i x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i (1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} q_{ik}) \\ &\geq \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1} \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_i \eta_j F^2(\tilde{\rho}_i, \tilde{\rho}_j)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i (1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \langle \tilde{\psi}_{ik} | \tilde{\psi}_{ik} \rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Because of the definition of $\tilde{\rho}_i$, we know that $\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \langle \tilde{\psi}_{ik} | \tilde{\psi}_{ik} \rangle = \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_i)$. So,

$$P_0 \geq \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1} \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_i \eta_j F^2(\tilde{\rho}_i, \tilde{\rho}_j)} + \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i (1 - \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_i)), \quad (53)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P &= 1 - P_0 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_i) - \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1} \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_i \eta_j F^2(\tilde{\rho}_i, \tilde{\rho}_j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

$\square$

V. SET DISCRIMINATION OF MIXED STATES

In section II, we point out that the unambiguous discrimination of mixed states can be performed by unambiguous set discrimination of pure states. Conversely,

an interesting problem is whether we can perform unambiguous set discrimination by discriminating mixed states. For this purpose, we first generalize the concept of set discrimination.

Suppose $S_i = \{\sigma_i^k : k = 1, \dots, n_i\}$ is a set of mixed quantum states and $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$ for any $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ with $i \neq j$. Assume that a quantum system is secretly prepared in one of the mixed states in $\bigcup_{i=1}^m S_i$. We intend to tell which set of $\{S_i\}$ the unknown state is in. Obviously, when each set S_i is a singleton, this problem reduces to mixed state discrimination. A surprising fact is that any unambiguous set discrimination can be reduced to unambiguous mixed state discrimination, as the following theorem states.

Theorem 4 *For any mixed quantum states σ_i^k , $i = 1, \dots, m$, $k = 1, \dots, n_i$, with prior probability η_{ik} , the problem of unambiguously discriminating the sets $S_i = \{\sigma_i^k : k = 1, \dots, n_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, is equivalent to that of unambiguously discriminating states $\rho_i = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{\eta_{ik}}{\eta'_i} \sigma_i^k$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, in the sense that they have the same efficiency, where $\eta'_i = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \eta_{ik}$ is the prior probability of ρ_i .*

Proof. For any measurement operators $\{\Pi_i : i = 0, \dots, m\}$, they can unambiguously discriminate the sets $\{S_i\}$ if and only if for any $i, j = 1, \dots, m$, $i \neq j$,

$$\text{Tr}(\sigma_i^k \Pi_j) = 0. \quad (55)$$

On the other hand, for any $\rho_i = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{\eta_{ik}}{\eta'_i} \text{Tr}(\sigma_i^k \Pi_j)$, it holds that

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_i \Pi_j) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{\eta_{ik}}{\eta'_i} \text{Tr}(\sigma_i^k \Pi_j). \quad (56)$$

Because $\frac{\eta_{ik}}{\eta'_i} > 0$, $\sigma_i^k \geq 0$, and $\Pi_j > 0$, we know that $\text{Tr}(\rho_i \Pi_j) = 0$ if and only if for any k , $\text{Tr}(\sigma_i^k \Pi_j) = 0$. So a necessary and sufficient condition for the measurement operators $\{\Pi_i : i = 1, \dots, m\}$ to unambiguously discriminate $\{\rho_i : \rho_i = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{\eta_{ik}}{\eta'_i} \sigma_i^k\}$ is that for any $i \neq j$, $\text{Tr}(\sigma_i^k \Pi_j) = 0$. It is just the necessary and sufficient condition which ensures that $\{S_i\}$ can be unambiguously discriminated.

Furthermore, the measurement operators $\{\Pi_i\}$ can unambiguously discriminate mixed states $\{\rho_i\}$ with efficiency

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \sum_{i=1}^m \eta'_i \text{Tr}(\Pi_i \rho_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \eta'_i \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{\eta_{ik}}{\eta'_i} \text{Tr}(\Pi_i \sigma_i^k) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \eta_{ik} \text{Tr}(\Pi_i \sigma_i^k), \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

which is also the efficiency of measurement operators $\{\Pi_i\}$ to unambiguously discriminate $\{S_i\}$. $\square$

In some cases, a quantum system is secretly selected in some known mixed states, which cannot be discriminated unambiguously. So it is impossible to decide the exact state of the system unambiguously. It is easy to conceive that if we only want to know a certain range of states the system is in, we can perform a set discrimination which may be able to be unambiguous. As shown in Ref. [14], this is true for pure states. However, for mixed states, from Theorem 4, we know that the problem of unambiguously discriminating sets can be reduced to that of unambiguously discriminating mixed states. So, the information we can obtain from the system by using a set discrimination is the same as that we obtain by discriminating the system among a fewer number of some mixed states. Thus, unlike the problem of set discrimination for pure states, which have many useful and unique results, it is needless to deal with that of "set discrimination for mixed states" specially.

VI. SUMMARY

In this paper, we propose a method to transform each mixed state being discriminated into the sum of two density matrices: one matrix whose support space is linearly independent to each other is called the "core" of the state, while the other one has no contribution to discrimination. In this way, we can reduce the problem of unambiguously discriminating mixed states into that of unambiguously discriminating sets of pure states derived from the "core"s. It is shown that a necessary and sufficient condition for unambiguously discriminating mixed states is whether each of their "core"s is not zero. We also evaluate the efficiency of unambiguous discrimination among mixed states, and present an upper bound on it. Finally, we generalize the concept of set discrimination to mixed states, and point out that the unambiguous discrimination of mixed state sets is equivalent to unambiguous discrimination of mixed states.

- [1] I.D. Ivanovic, Phys. Lett. A 123, 257 (1987).
[2] D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A 126, 303 (1988).

- [3] A. Peres, Phys. Lett. A 128, 19 (1988).
[4] G. Jaeger, A. Shimony, Phys. Lett. A 197, 83(1995).

- [5] A. Chefles, Phys. Lett. A 239, 339(1998).
- [6] X. M. Sun, S. Y. Zhang, Y. Feng, M. S. Ying, Phys. Rev. A 65, 044306(2002).
- [7] Y.C.Eldar, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol 49, pp.446-456, Feb.2003.
- [8] S. Y. Zhang, Y. Feng, X. M. Sun, M. S. Ying, Phys. Rev. A 64, 062103(2001).
- [9] Y. Feng, S. Y. Zhang, R. Y. Duan, and M. S. Ying, Phys. Rev. A 66, 062303 (2002).
- [10] T. Rudolph, R. W. Spekkens, P. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. A 68, 010301(R)(2003).
- [11] P. Raynal, N. Lutkenhaus, S. J. van Enk, Phys. Rev. A 68, 022308
- [12] J. Fiurasek and M. Jezek, Phys. Rev. A 67, 012321 (2003).
- [13] Y.C.Eldar, A.Megretski, G.C.Verghese, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol 50, pp.1198-1207 JUN 2004.
- [14] S. Y. Zhang, M. S. Ying, Phys. Rev. A 65, 062322 (2002).
- [15] Y. Feng, R. Y. Duan, M. S. Ying, Phys. Rev. A 70, 012308 (2004).
- [16] Y.C.Eldar, M. Stojnic and B. Hassibi Phys. Rev. A 69, 062318 (2004).
- [17] A. Chefles, Phys. Rev. A 69, 050307 (2004).
- [18] In this paper, the sum of subspace means the space in which any vector can be written as a linear combination of vectors from those subspaces, such as

$$\sum_i S_i = \{ \sum_i a_i |v_i\rangle \mid |v_i\rangle \in S_i \}. \quad (58)$$